DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 671 EA 023 151

AUTHOR Olson, Thomas A.; And Others
TITLE Designing Meaningful Professional Development: A Planning Tool. Field Test Version. Program Report Series.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 91
CONTRACT RP91002001
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; Outcomes of Education; *Professional Development; Program Design; Program Development; Program Implementation; *Staff Development; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

There is growing public recognition that the most important route to educational improvement is through enhancing the skills and status of adults who work within the education system. The purpose of this document is to provide a resource to school personnel who are attempting to improve their professional development efforts; hence both sections of the document are designed to be used as a research "briefing" for teachers and administrators. The first section provides a brief review of what is known about successful learners and then reviews research findings about effective practices that help at-risk students become successful learners. The second section leads planning groups through a series of discussions and self-analyses regarding standards for effective professional development. The standards are organized around what is known about adult learners, effective professional development program characteristics, and organizational processes that facilitate professional development. Both sections provide self-assessment instruments to allow schools and districts to reflect on the current status of their professional development strategies. (131 references) (EJS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

THE Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

# PROGRAM REPORT

ED334671

## DESIGNING MEANINGFUL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A PLANNING TOOL

FIELD TEST VERSION

June 1, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Kirkpatrick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by

Thomas A. Olson,
Jocelyn A. Butler,
Nancey L. Olson,

**The Education Profession Program**
Thomas A. Olson, Director

**Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory**
**101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500**
**Portland, Oregon 97204**

EA 023 151

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sponsored by OERI Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education

This publication has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number RP91002001. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

# DESIGNING MEANINGFUL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A PLANNING TOOL

FIELD TEST VERSION

June 1, 1991

Prepared by

Thomas A. Olson,
Jocelyn A. Butler,
Nancey L. Olson,

The Education Profession Program
Thomas A. Olson, Director

**NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY**
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


Page

I. BACKGROUND ..... 1

II. PURPOSE AND AUDIENCE FOR THE DOCUMENT ..... 4

III. GETTING READY: EXAMINING STUDENT OUTCOMES ..... 5

A. Research Briefing on Characteristics of the Successful Learner ..... 5

B. Self Analysis Form: Our View of Successful Learning ..... 7

C. Research Briefing on Helping At-Risk Students Become Successful Learners ..... 9

D. Self Analysis Form: Effective Practices For At Risk Students ..... 12

IV. EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE BEST ROUTE TO IMPROVEMENT ..... 14

A. Introduction ..... 14

B. Targeting Professional Development to the Needs of the Adult Learner ..... 15

1. Research Briefing on What We Know About Adult Learners ..... 15

2. Self Analysis Form: Analyzing How Well Our Professional Development is Targeted to Our Needs as Adult Learners ..... 18

3. Research Briefing on Effective Professional Development Program Characteristics ..... 19

4. Self Analysis Form: Examining Our Professional Development Program Characteristics ..... 23

5. Research Briefing on Changing the Organization to Support Better Professional Development ..... 25

6. Shared Decision Making Chart.....31

7. Self Analysis Form: Examining Our Organizational Support for Professional Development.....32

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BACKGROUND

The past decade has seen a significant increase in interest and attention on the education profession. While this attention has taken many forms, there is a growing public recognition that the most important route to educational improvement is through enhancing the skills and status of the adults who work within the education system.

The early stages of the educational reform movement of the late 1970's and early 1980's tended to focus on simultaneous loosening and tightening of requirements for entering or exiting pre-service training. On the one hand, more than forty states created "alternative routes" to certification--easing entry into teaching. At the same time, state policies requiring more rigorous entrance standards into teacher education, additional pre-service courses, and testing basic skills of teacher candidates abounded in the early 1980's. Analysts have pointed out that these actions reflected the historic "industrial model" of our schools. Under this vision, there was the assumption that knowledge about effectiveness could be standardized and must be prescribed to all teachers. School-level administrators and teachers were thus viewed as assembly line workers who required tight control and direction. Indeed, many of the mandates of the early stages of the reform movement reflected this mentality. Further, with a minimal amount of initial "training", this vision assumed that virtually anyone could become a skillful teacher. These assumptions are now being seriously challenged in the second wave of the reform movement. More recent state policy initiatives reflect a growing public desire to equip teachers and administrators with improved professional status, knowledge, skills, and decision-making prerogatives.

Actions in the states in the Northwest reflect this changing view of educators and their needs. Recent developments include:

- Oregon's House Bill 2020, providing major resources for improved staff development, school improvement, and mentoring new teachers
- Alaska's comprehensive statewide network for staff development
- Idaho's state appropriation for support for school improvement programs and a mentoring program for new teachers
- Montana's requirement in their new accreditation standards that all schools must develop a comprehensive professional development plan
- Washington's "Schools for the 21st Century", which provides state money and waivers of requirements for schools wishing to implement staff development/ school improvement efforts.
- Major initiatives sponsored by the state administrator associations (e.g., Project L.E.A.D.) and state teachers associations (e.g., Learning Laboratories, Mastery in Learning) that are developing knowledge, skill, and new decision-making models.

Several contextual conditions in American society (Cook, 1988; Hodgkinson, 1985 and 1989; McCune, 1986; United Way, 1989) are influencing this changing view of the job of teaching and administering in our schools. Two converging

forces are placing the education profession at the center of the current reform and restructuring movement. Increased numbers of students are being placed at risk of failing and dropping out of school (Pallas, et.al. 1988). A variety of changing social and economic conditions make instruction of this growing at-risk population much more difficult. While schools are attempting to meet these unprecedented instructional challenges, we find growing economic pressures for a more technically skilled work force, capable of more demanding intellectual tasks. The collision of these two forces (growing at-risk population and demands for a more skilled work force) is leading to changes in public expectations of our schools. No longer are the various publics satisfied with the fact that large numbers of students drop out of middle and high school. Unlike past eras, there is now no productive place in today's economy for the drop out. Thus, the public now demands that schools ensure the development of a much more challenging set of outcomes for all students. These outcomes were once reserved for the "gifted and talented", but now we recognize that in order to succeed in adult life, all students must be, in the words of the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, "knowledgeable, self-determined, strategic, and empathetic" human beings (Jones and Fennimore, 1990).

With the demand for a higher order set of outcomes comes a major shift in accountability in American education. For decades, school districts have been held accountable for the range of opportunities they have provided (facilities, materials, curriculum offerings, etc.). But now the public is holding schools directly accountable for new set of outcomes for all students (Finn, 1990). Such a major shift demands changes in public and professional beliefs, values, and attitudes toward underperforming learners. It is no longer sufficient to say, "Our schools provide a rich array of opportunities; if the students don't take advantage of these opportunities, they must suffer the consequences." We are experiencing a major shift from past practice of holding students accountable for the outcomes to now holding the schools directly accountable.

At the same time that we are experiencing these fundamental changes in accountability, we are witnessing unprecedented change and ferment within the education profession. Major curriculum changes are happening in science and mathematics. Moving toward "authentic" performance assessment, rather than the current over-reliance on standardized tests is occupying front page attention (Newman, 1991). Our knowledge of effective instructional practices continues to grow and challenge entrenched practice--particularly in working with at-risk children and youth. The "restructuring" movement is challenging educators to devise new uses of time, organize content differently, and change the rules, roles, and relationships in the professional working environment in our schools. And, perhaps most important, we are experiencing a major change in our view of the act of learning itself. We have shifted from the behaviorist view of the learner as "empty vessel" into which we pour information to the current "contructivist" view of the learner as an active participant in the learning process. In this current view, it is the learner, not the teacher, who ultimately creates meaning out of the curriculum and instruction, relating it to his/her own past experience and environment. Such a view dramatically alters the historic role of the teacher.

Finally, the social and economic context in which this wave of reform is occurring is stretching the historic mission of our schools. The aging of the American population, the growing poverty levels among pre-school children, accelerating cultural and racial diversity, and dramatic change in the fabric and nature of the American family all cause our schools (perhaps our most stable of social

institutions) to take on social challenges unheard of thirty years ago. And this is happening in a time of increasingly restrictive limits of available resources for schools.

It is this milieu of change that is spotlighting desire for change in the education profession. We now have "front burner" public attention on those who must implement the many improvements called for. We have numerous policy statements of the need to "professionalize" the role of teaching and administering in our schools. We have a societal movement toward decentralizing decision making and taking the necessary steps to "empower" people to make better decisions. And, finally, we have a growing knowledge base upon which we can draw.

## PURPOSE AND AUDIENCE FOR THE DOCUMENT

The purpose of this document is to provide a resource to school personnel who are attempting to improve their professional development efforts. Each section is designed to be used as a research "briefing" for teachers and administrators. After each section, a self-assessment instrument is provided to allow schools and districts to reflect on the current status of their professional development strategies in light of the research findings described in that section.

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) will field test this document in three sites seeking to improve their professional development programs. The self assessment instruments will be used by NWREL to help the sites construct baseline information about their current professional development efforts and to plan improvements in professional development strategies. These plans will be implemented and monitored over a four-year period. Impacts on organizational processes, teaching practices, and student outcomes will be studied and reported over this period of time. The ultimate intent of this research effort is to add to our knowledge base about the kinds of professional development strategies which can yield improved student outcomes for all students.

The document is organized in the order in which the self analysis will occur in the local sites. The first section, "Getting Ready: Examining Student Outcomes," will be the beginning point of the discussion in the local sites. This section provides a brief review of what we know about successful learners and then reviews research findings about effective practice that helps at-risk students become successful learners. The second section, "Effective Professional Development: The Best Route to Improvement," will lead planning groups through a series of discussions and self analyses regarding standards for effective professional development. These standards are organized around what we know about (a) adult learners, (b) effective professional development program characteristics, and (c) necessary organizational processes to facilitate effective professional development.

## GETTING READY: EXAMINING STUDENT OUTCOMES

Read this brief overview of the kinds of student outcomes which emerge from the study of research on successful learners. Then complete the self-analysis form at the end of this section.

Research Briefing on Characteristics of the Successful Learner

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory has conducted an examination of the research on the characteristics of successful learners (Jones and Fennimore, 1990). They suggest that successful learners need to be "knowledgeable, self-determined, strategic, and empathetic." This section provides the description of each of these four characteristics:

### Knowledgeable Learners

Successful learners have amassed substantial knowledge of content and can use it to think with fluency and authority. They can define and solve problems critically and creatively. They have a strong sense of what they believe and why, and they constantly evaluate the quality of information they receive and produce. They devote substantial time to reflecting and puzzling. They are aware of the different perspectives that others may offer on a topic. They value diversity and work hard to be fair minded.

### Self Determined Learners

Successful learners consciously use and expand the tools they have to engage in meaningful learning. They are highly motivated and feel they have the power to promote their own development. They feel good about themselves as learners, confident that they can succeed. They have firm beliefs about the value of hard work and the effects of it on their success. Successful learners persevere in the face of difficulties. Successful learners also regard the world as full of opportunities to learn. They consider choices, examine reasons and observe the consequences of their actions.

### Strategic Learners

Successful students have a repertoire of effective strategies for learning various subjects, for thinking and controlling their own learning, for detecting errors and fallacies in their thinking and the thinking of others, for problem solving and decision making, and for thinking creatively. Using these strategies, they can organize what they know and construct mental models, plan their study time, and decrease anxiety. They can monitor their comprehension and problem solving, constantly pausing to compare the new information to prior knowledge, check what they have learned and what they need to review, and summarize. Successful students learn to orchestrate these strategies in a dynamic flow as they move in and out of different tasks and phases of learning.

Empathetic

Successful students recognize that much of their success involves their ability to communicate with others. However, they are also able to view themselves and the world through the eyes of others. This means not only examining one's beliefs critically, including beliefs and judgments about the self, but also examining the beliefs and circumstances of others, keeping in mind the goal of enhanced understanding and appreciation. These interpersonal skills are particularly important in understanding and appreciating other cultures. Meaningful learning involves learning how to identify the strengths of others, as well as how to be supportive in give-and-take relationships. Successful students value sharing experiences with persons of different backgrounds as ways of enriching their lives.

**Self Analysis Form: Our View of Successful Learning**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. (Circle the appropriate number on the scale for each item.)

*1 = Strongly Disagree* *2 = Agree* *3 = Unsure*
*4 = Agree* *5 = Strongly Agree*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | The above description of successful learners is a close match with our operating philosophy | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. | All students can become the type of successful learners described in the above section | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. | We currently offer curriculum and instruction to help students become "knowledgeable" learners as defined above | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. | We currently measure and discuss at the school and district level the extent to which students are becoming "knowledgeable" learners | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. | We currently offer curriculum and instruction to help students become "self-determined" as described above | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. | We currently measure and discuss at the school and district level the extent to which students are becoming "self determined" | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. | We currently offer curriculum and instruction to help students become "strategic" learners as described above | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. | We currently measure and discuss at the school and district level the extent to which students are becoming "strategic" learners | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. | We currently offer curriculum and instruction to help students become "empathetic" as described above | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. | We currently measure and discuss at the school and district level the extent to which students are becoming "empathetic" | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Indicate how you currently feel about how well your school/district is helping students develop their abilities to be: (Circle the appropriate number on the scale for each item.)

*1 = Terrible* *2 = Poor* *3 = Adequate*
*4 = Good* *5 = Excellent*

11. knowledgeable 1 2 3 4 5

12. self determined 1 2 3 4 5

13. strategic 1 2 3 4 5

14. empathetic 1 2 3 4 5

Which of the four categories of successful learners should receive the highest priority for professional development in your school/district? (check one only)

15.a. _____ knowledgeable

15.b. _____ self determined

15.c. _____ strategic

15.d. _____ empathetic

Research Briefing on Helping At-Risk Students Become Successful Learners

As mentioned in the background section, educators today are faced with the challenge of preparing all students to be knowledgeable, self-determined, strategic, and empathetic learners. And a variety of school and non-school conditions are making this increasingly difficult. Teachers and administrators are wrestling with the dramatic increase in the numbers of students who are at risk of failing and dropping out of school. We know the factors that are early warning signals about dropping out. These signals include students with low or deteriorating grades and test scores, a pattern of absence from school and a history of behavioral problems. Students who possess all three of these conditions have a very high chance of dropping out. We also know that these conditions can be spotted very early and can be alleviated. They cannot be alleviated by merely assuming that minority or low socio-economic status cause these conditions. They do not. They can be alleviated by focusing on those things which can be done in classrooms and schools. This section discusses the practices in your classrooms and schools which can make a significant difference in helping at-risk students become successful learners.

First of all, effective classroom practice with at-risk students is generally effective practice with all students. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory has studied the research findings regarding classrooms where all students perform well. (Conklin and Olson, 1988 and Cotton, 1990). We know that teachers in these classrooms:

- Hold high expectations for all students regardless of socio-economic status. Such expectations include high achievement of both basic and higher order skills by all students.
- Manifest a sense of responsibility and "efficacy." This means that teachers see learning problems as correctable by adjusting and adapting teaching practice, rather than assigning the cause of the problem to the student or the student's background. These teachers do not "give up" on a student.
- Make effective and efficient use of class time through clear directions and instruction, equitable questioning of all students, minimal interruptions for discipline, checking for student understanding and reteaching as necessary, and maintaining a brisk instructional pace.
- Demonstrating personal warmth while demanding high performance.
- Respect and incorporate the students' home culture into the classroom.
- Adjust instructional techniques to culturally conditioned learning styles (e.g., use of cooperative learning and cross-age peer tutoring for students from backgrounds such as Native Hawaiian and Native American).
- Monitor all students' work regularly and provide constructive feedback and reteaching as necessary.
- Assure that all levels of thinking are required on the part of all students.

- Maintain a task orientation.
- Relate current learning to past learning.
- Provide reinforcement and rewards for positive performance
- Actively involve parents of underperforming students in ways to help reinforce classroom instruction (homework practices, etc.)

While this list of practices will seem "old hat" to most experienced teachers and administrators, several points need to be made about these research findings. First, while they were arguable ten years ago, they are no longer. Second, the idea of skillfully combining higher order thinking with basic skills is often unmentioned in lists of effective teaching practices. The old paradigm that low performing students must attain basic skills before they can receive instruction in higher order thinking is now challenged by the current research (Presseissen, 1987). Endless repetition of drill and practice on low order skills for under-performing, disadvantaged children has been ineffective and a too typical practice (Rowan and Guthrie, 1988). We are realizing that the often well-intentioned approaches to basic skills remediation have been misguided. Beyond the basic skills, the disadvantaged, underperforming students need "learning to learn" skills, thinking skills, basic reasoning skills, and communication skills.

Another point is that recent research is confirming the power of providing greater cultural relevance in the classroom. Research evidence is mounting that the extent to which there is cultural relevance in the classroom is one significant predictor of academic success (Cummins, 1986). Of particular importance in classrooms with minority students is the finding that how children interact is very much influenced by the mode of parent-child interaction. For example, direct questioning of Native American children often evokes silence. Such silence does not necessarily mean the child does not understand or know the answer. Rather, the home culture regards active demonstration of knowledge as unseemly. The same is true when a teacher wants the student to debate a proposition. Many tribes favor a less direct and non-persuasive way of expressing dissent (Witkin, 1978; Philips, 1983). So minority students must often tread a confusing line of trying to understand the teacher's expectations in light of a different set of expectations at home.

The concept of "warmth" and "caring" teaching is only now beginning to be recognized as a characteristic well supported in the research literature. Yet, in the bilingual classroom, for example, the quality and sincerity of the interaction between teacher and students is a key element in engaging and encouraging, rather than alienating and discouraging, the students (E.E. Garcia, 1988; H. Garcia, 1988).

Finally, research suggests that the way students are grouped can have a major effect on student performance--particularly underperforming students. These research findings suggest that we adopt a new assumption about under-performing students. If we truly believe that all students can learn, the research on grouping practices causes us to organize learning groups to accelerate learning for all students, rather than select out the high performers from the low performers (Cuban, 1989; Oakes, 1985; Olson, 1990). And the research suggests that both high and low performing students do better academically in classes that include students with a wide range of academic ability. The impact is

most positive for low performing students. Further, only high-ability students tend to benefit from "ability" grouping (and then in only a very limited way). We also know that there are harmful effects of long term ability grouping on low performing students.

Appropriately organized, cooperative learning and cross-age peer tutoring are proving particularly effective in reducing off-task behavior and improving abstract thinking, problem solving, and critical thinking. Self-concept, self-esteem, and interpersonal relations are also enhanced (Slavin, 1980, 1987, 1989; Ward, 1987) through these grouping practices.

**Self Analysis Form: Effective Practices For At Risk Students**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements.

*1 = Strongly Disagree* *2 = Agree* *3 = Unsure*
*4 = Agree* *5 = Strongly Agree*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Our school/district has a priority on improving performance of at-risk students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. | When we look at our achievement test data, we look particularly at the percent of our students in the lowest quartile. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. | We have an operating definition of "at risk" that every one understands. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. | We have defined goals for improving at-risk students' behavior. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. | We have early intervention programs that try to help students with academic, behavior, and absence problems at an early age. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. | We have good involvement of parents of our at-risk students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. | We do a successful job of blending the teaching of higher order with basic skills for our low performing students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. | Every at-risk student has at least one adult "advocate" in our school. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. | We have successful approaches to ensure cultural relevance of our curriculum and instructional practices. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. | We frequently use cooperative learning for heterogeneous groups. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. | We frequently use peer tutoring. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. | We have eliminated long term ability grouping in our school/district. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. | We have a lot of pull-out "programs" in our school/district. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14. | We have had a professional development priority on working with at-risk students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. | We have good working relationships with other social service agencies that help at-risk students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. | We have a good "track record" in improving the performance of at-risk students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Please list below the top three issues about working with at-risk youth that should receive the highest priority in your school/district professional development program.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

## EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE BEST ROUTE TO IMPROVEMENT

### Introduction

Effective professional development for employees has become an integral part of successful organizations that provide high quality service or products (Waterman, 1987). While professional development activities have been a part of educational organizations for decades, rarely have they been comprehensive, lasting, or an integral part of the day-to-day life of schools. With the increased expectation that the entire workforce will need to become lifelong learners who continue to master new knowledge and skill, it is critical that schools model such approaches with their own staffs. The types of changes in outcomes and practices in working with at-risk students discussed in the previous section demand that teachers and administrators have opportunities to grow and develop professionally. And we have a growing knowledge base about how to create professional development opportunities that are effective and meaningful. This section turns our attention to this research knowledge.

We have organized this discussion around the following three key concepts:

- Effective professional development must be targeted to the needs of the learner.
- There are known characteristics of the structure and processes of effective professional development programs.
- Most schools/districts need to change some organizational "norms," rules, and support systems to foster more effective professional development.

Each of these concepts is expanded upon below. A set of self-analysis questions is provided after each section.

**Targeting Professional Development to the Needs of the Adult Learner**

*"The learner is a person who wants something; the learner is a person who notices something; the learner is a person who does something; the learner is a person who gets something." (Dollard in Kidd, 1975, p. 17)*

Learning requires that learners undergo some type of change. Understanding the nature of that change is essential in building effective professional development. Research on the implementation of innovations has defined elements of change that can be applied to professional development programs (Hall and Loucks, 1978):

- Change is a process, not an event. Introduction to and development of new ways of doing things does not assure that people will immediately begin to do them. Change is a process that must unfold over time.
- Change always happens to individuals first, then to organizations. Each person perceives, feels about, and reacts to change in an individual way.
- People who undergo change go through several classic stages of concerns. This is natural and should be accommodated in any professional development effort.

Research Briefing on What We Know About Adult Learners

There is a continuing debate between some theorists who believe that adult learning and child learning are significantly different and others who believe that the process of learning does not change and that "learning is learning at any age." There is no compelling research evidence to support either camp. Research does suggest, however, some commonly agreed-upon descriptions of adults as learners, as follows:

- Adults do learn throughout their lives. Age does not reduce a person's ability to learn. It may reduce the speed at which learning takes place. Also, because of time elapsed since earlier learning experiences, adults may underestimate their own abilities to learn. They may also need some additional time to adjust to new learning conditions.
- Adults exhibit a variety of learning styles, and there is no one "right" way of learning. They learn in different ways, at different times, and for varying reasons.
- The adult's past experiences affect what the learner learns and are the foundations of his/her current learning. Learning takes place best when new learnings are tied directly to or built upon past experiences.

- The adult learner's stage of development (novice or experienced teacher, early adult or mid-life, etc.) has profound effects on the individual's learning needs.

- Adults are motivated to learn by changes in their work situations. They learn best when new learnings apply in practical ways and/or are relevant to these changes.

- The individual adult learner controls what is learned, selecting new information and deciding how to use it. There is no such thing as "group learning." It happens to and is controlled by the individual learner. Unless the individual takes responsibility for learning and is a self-motivated and active learner, learning will rarely happen.

- Adults tend to be problem centered and learn better through practical applications of what they have learned.

- New learning needs to be followed by time for reflection on how the learning applies to the adult's work situation.

- Continued learning depends on achieving satisfaction, especially in the sense of making progress toward learning goals that reflect the learner's own goals.

- Adult learners must be treated as adults and respected as self-directed persons. They learn best in non-threatening environments of trust and mutual respect.

Effective professional development programs should take into account the nature of adult learners and the need for making learning accessible to them. Smith (1982) suggests that there are six optimum conditions for learning, and that adults learn best when these six conditions are met:

1. They feel the need to learn and have input into what, why, and how they will learn.

2. Learning's content and processes bear a meaningful relationship to past experience. That experience is used as a resource for learning.

3. What is to be learned relates optimally to the individual's developmental changes and life tasks.

4. The amount of autonomy exercised by the learner is congruent with that required by the mode or method utilized.

5. They learn in a climate that minimizes anxiety and encourages freedom to experiment.

6. Their learning styles are taken into account.

There are also some major motivational factors which have a powerful influence on the adult learner. The "bottom line" is that no one truly motivates someone else. Motivation must come from within the individual. But we do know several important things about the kinds of conditions which facilitate individuals to

become motivated (Wlodkowski, 1985). First, at the beginning of the learning process, the learner's attitudes (toward the environment, the instructor, the topic at hand, and the self) and the learner's needs (immediate and at the time of the learning) should be acknowledged and addressed. During the learning sequence, stimulation and the learner's affect should be carefully monitored and acknowledged. Finally, at the end of the sequence, the learner must feel a sense of competence (increased value because of this new learning) and should be reinforced. These kinds of things can significantly improve the conditions within which people can increase their individual motivation.

Generally speaking, then, adult learners need to be interested, successful, and supported in their learning, and such intrinsic motivators are critical to program success. Lanier and Little (1986) caution against the use of external motivation in the form of cash incentives, citing several studies in which paying teachers and administrators to participate is efficient in attracting them to professional development activities, but is inversely related to classroom implementation of the recommended practices. The challenge is for schools to create the time and resources so that professional development is the normal part of daily work life.

Professional development, then, needs to focus on teachers and administrators as a population of adult learners with specialized experience and needs. This experience and these needs must be an integral part of any effective professional development program.

**Self Analysis Form: Analyzing How Well Our Professional Development is Targeted to Our Needs as Adult Learners**

Now that you have considered the above research findings regarding the nature of adult learning and motivation, use the following self-analysis questions to reflect on how well your professional development opportunities match these findings.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements

*1 = Strongly Disagree* *2 = Agree* *3 = Unsure*
*4 = Agree* *5 = Strongly Agree*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Our staff feels and often expresses the need to continue learning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. | We have good input into what, why, and how we will learn as a school staff. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. | Our professional development activities are tied into and built upon our past experiences. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. | Our individual learning styles are taken into account when professional development is designed. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. | Our professional development activities are applied in practical ways that are related to our daily work. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. | We consciously take into account where individual staff members are in their career stage (novice, experienced professional) when we design professional development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. | Our professional development activities minimize anxiety and encourage freedom to experiment. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. | Our professional development activities occur in environments of trust and mutual respect. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. | We are treated as self-directed, self-managed learners in our professional development programs. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Research Briefing on Effective Professional Development Program Characteristics

The nature of professional development programs has expanded over the past decade. This has been driven by the changing paradigm of the role of the educational professional. Any true "professional", whether it be in law, medicine, accounting, or education, must constantly be a "reflective" practitioner. Simmons and Schuette (1988) suggest that for teachers and administrators this means:

> one who makes instructional decisions consciously and tentatively, critically considers a full range of pertinent contextual and pedagogical factors, actively seeks evidence about the results, and continues to modify these decisions as the situation warrants. (p. 20)

This concept of "reflection" as a hallmark of the professional has begun to change our view of the kinds of programs which can foster professionalism. Historically, professional development has meant "in-service training." Equating professional development with the narrow concept of "training" was influenced by the old public view of educators as less-than-professional functionaries who needed to be given new skills or had deficits in their current skills. Therefore, they needed "training" to gain new skills or "fix" problems with their current skills. Research is suggesting the need for significant change in this approach to professional development.

Fullen et. al. (1990) examine key aspects of what they call the "teacher as learner." (They include all professional educators under the term "teacher.") They propose that there are four key aspects of the teacher as learner:

- Technical repertoire: mastery of a variety of skills and practices which increases instructional certainty
- Reflective practice: careful consideration that results in enhancement of clarity, meaning, and coherence in teacher practice
- Research: exploration and investigation to discover ways to improve practice
- Collaboration: focused interchange with fellow teachers to give and receive ideas and assistance.

They point out that rarely have all of these aspects been given the necessary attention in the same setting. The complex challenge is to how to develop professional development which integrates all four of these aspects as part of an effective professional development program.

Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1988), in their extensive review of the research, suggest that five major types of models need to be considered in building a comprehensive program of professional development:

- Individually-guided: individuals identify, plan, and pursue activities they believe will support their own individual learning

- Observation/assessment: teachers are observed directly and given objective data and feedback about their classroom performance

- Involvement in a development/improvement process: participating in group and individual activities to develop curriculum, design programs, or become involved in school improvement processes to solve general or specific problems

- Training: individual or group instruction in which teachers acquire knowledge or skills

- Inquiry: teachers and administrators identify and collect data in an area of interest, analyze and interpret the data, and apply their findings to their own individual practice.

Note in the above framework, "training" is but one of five models for professional development. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley point out that it is the most widely used, and therefore the one that has received the most research attention. The knowledge base on the necessary characteristics of the other four is very limited. The remainder of this section deals with the research findings regarding training. But we encourage the reader to regard training as only one of at least five necessary kinds of activities in a comprehensive professional development program. Only then can we truly say we have a program which addresses all the needs of the educator as reflective practitioner.

Sparks and Loucks-Horsley cite a number of studies in which training programs have been tied to improvement in particular types of student performance. Gage (1984) also reported that in eight of nine experimental studies he examined, "inservice education was fairly effective--not with all teachers and not with all teaching practices, but effective enough to change teachers and improve student achievement, or attitudes, or behavior." (p. 92). We know that training can lead to improvements. And research suggests some key characteristics of effective training programs.

The content of training is critical. Gall et. al. (1985) report that, in terms of content, "Research shows the most effective staff development programs are designed for school improvement rather than for personal professional improvement." Further, research suggests that content needs to be concrete and aimed at developing specific skills rather than just introducing new concepts. The theoretical basis or rationale needs to be an integral part of this content. Also, the extent to which the content is research-based enhances the program's effectiveness. The content also reflects clear program goals and operational objectives, builds on participant's past experiences, and prepares participants to apply what they have learned.

A review of a number of other research efforts suggests the following guidelines regarding the structure of the training programs.

- The most effective programs are conducted in school settings rather than "pull out" training programs.

- Development takes place in more than one event, and events are spaced over time: they are conducted long enough and often enough

to assure that participants progressively gain knowledge, skill, and confidence.

- Training is scheduled at convenient locations to avoid undue interference with ongoing job requirements of the participants.
- The trainers have credibility with the participants.
- The training is based on participants' needs and relates to their own past experiences.

The instructional processes used in the training programs also appear to influence the program's level of impact. Several researchers have studied program components to identify those which are essential. Joyce and Showers (1980) identified five components of effective development programs that have become widely acknowledged as important:

- Presentation of theory or description of the new skill or strategy
- Good modeling or demonstrations of skills or models
- Practicing the skills or models in simulated and actual situations
- Structured and open-ended feedback to provide information about performance in that practice
- Coaching for application, the follow-up work to help with the at-home implementation of the new skill and/or knowledge.

These components vary in their importance to helping people change skills, with evidence strongest for the effects of modeling and feedback. Joyce and Showers hypothesize that the combination of all five components has the greatest power.

Showers, et. al. (1987) examine the necessary kind of practice for actual transference of new skills into regular use: "For a complex model of teaching to reach implementation, we estimate that about 25 (practice) teaching episodes ...are necessary before all the conditions of transfer are achieved." (p. 86) This repeated practice is necessary to enable and achieve teachers' full integration of the new strategy into their teaching repertoire, and to assure that the new approach will not be lost due to disuse.

Other researchers emphasize the importance of follow-up of training sessions, noting that coaching is but one of a number of activities to assist in transfer of new learning. Fullan (1982) describes follow-through as crucial: "A series of several sessions, with intervals between, in which people have the chance to try things (with some access to help or to other resources), is much more powerful than even the most stimulating one-shot workshop." (p. 286) Joyce and Showers (1988) report that follow-up coaching results in teachers generally using new instructional strategies introduced in training programs more often and with greater skill, using them more appropriately, exhibiting better long-term retention of knowledge and skills, more likely to explain new models to students, and having generally clearer understanding of the purposes and uses of new strategies.

Little (1986) adds that professional development is most influential where it ensures collaboration among teachers and administrators. When this collaboration works well, it produces shared understanding, shared investment, thoughtful development, and opportunities for professionals to give ideas a fair and rigorous test. More will be said about this collaboration in the section about organizational conditions.

**Self Analysis Form: Examining our Professional Development Program Characteristics**

After reading the above section on program characteristics, please complete the self assessment below.

*The Program*

Indicate below the extent to which each of the following types of professional development programs is provided in your school. (Circle the appropriate number on the scale for each item.

*1 = Rarely Used  2 = Sometimes Used  3 = Frequently Used*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Individually-guided staff development: (where individuals identify, plan, and pursue activities they believe will support their own learning) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. | Observation/assessment (where teachers are observed directly and given objective data and feedback about their classroom performance) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. | Involvement in a development/ improvement process: where teachers develop curriculum, design programs, or become involved in school improvement processes to solve general or specific problems) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. | training: (where individuals or groups receive structured, organized instruction in which new knowledge or skills are developed) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. | inquiry: (where teachers identify and collect data in an area of interest, analyze and interpret the data, and apply their findings to their own practice) | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Indicate your extent of agreement with the following:

*1 = Strongly Disagree* *2 = Agree* *3 = Unsure*
*4 = Agree* *5 = Strongly Agree*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6. | Our professional development programs are organized so that they take place in more than one incident and are conducted over a long enough period of time to assure that participants progressively gain knowledge, skill and confidence. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. | We have school-wide priorities for our professional development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. | The goals and objectives of our professional development are clear and specific. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. | The content of our professional development programs is research based and tied to student performance. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. | Follow-up help is included after training workshops. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. | We work with and learn from each other in our professional development programs. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Indicate below the extent to which each of the following is provided in your professional development programs. (Circle the appropriate number on the scale for each item.)

*1 = Rarely Provided* *2 = Sometimes Provided* *3 = Frequently Provided*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 12. | Presentation of theory or description of new skills or strategies | 1 2 3 |
| 13. | Modeling or demonstration of new skills or strategies | 1 2 3 |
| 14. | Practice in simulated and actual settings | 1 2 3 |
| 15. | Feedback about your performance as you try the new skill or strategy | 1 2 3 |
| 16. | Coaching as you continue to use the skill or strategy | 1 2 3 |

Research Briefing on Changing the Organization to Support Better Professional Development

As the focus of accountability is shifting from "opportunities" to "outcomes", the very nature of the school as a workplace is being brought into question. Under an "opportunities" system, school systems have been driven by a "command" structure--issuing orders and commands to provide specific kinds of learning opportunities to meet external mandates. Indeed, the first wave of the reform movement reflected this "control" orientation. Mandated improvements came from the district or state level--more courses to be required for graduation, more attention on the basics, more rigorous curriculum, more testing, etc. Yet these externally mandated efforts left the "deep structures" of schools largely untouched. Little was said about the basic rules, roles, and relationships in the school workplace. The reform requirements assumed that these structures did not need to change, since the educational system had a long and successful history of complying with externally imposed mandates and expectations. Much of the hierarchical structure of school systems was created to comply with these mandates. Schools were thus seen as "targets for reform" rather than "centers of reform." Under the "target" concept, schools were seen as relatively passive recipients and implementors of reform initiatives created elsewhere (Sirotnik and Clark, 1988). Under the "center" concept, school-level teachers and administrators assess their unique needs and generate improvement as part of their own motivation as professionals. It is this "center" concept that the movement toward professionalism is attempting to foster. Such a new paradigm requires significant change in the norms, rules, and kinds of support of the school system organizational structure. Thus the currently popular term, "restructuring."

The shifting view of educators as professionals and schools as centers of rather than targets for reform has been prompted by a change in the focus of our school systems. With the pressures for accountability for outcomes, school districts are trying to change their focus from "controlling opportunities" to "empowering results." And "people development" is seen as the best strategic route to achieving these results. Leaders in these kinds of organizations see their superordinate role as one of achieving results rather than exerting control (Evered and Selman, 1989). This change in focus is a societal trend in private business as well as public school districts (Waterman, 1987). In both settings, there is a move to change workplace conditions.

**Changing Workplace Conditions**

One of the most significant early works linking workplace conditions and school effectiveness identifies the following features as being present in successful schools (Little, 1982):

- Time is taken throughout the work week for training sessions, faculty meeting, or grade/department meetings to discuss critical practices.
- There is extensive collegial work.
- There is careful analysis and evaluation of experimentation, and experimentation is seen as a way of life.
- There is regular and frequent talk among teachers about teaching.

- There is a shared belief in continued improvement.
- Increasingly sophisticated demands are made on the nature and quality of external assistance.

Contrast these organizational characteristics with Lieberman and Miller's earlier findings about the day-to-day realities of teaching. (Lieberman and Miller, 1978). Their study of the daily lives of teachers revealed:

- Teaching style was highly personalized.
- Teachers in their study derived their rewards from work with students, not colleagues. Isolation from peers tended to be the norm.
- Links between effective teaching and learning were uncertain with little effort to seek out new research findings or expertise.
- Teaching was viewed as an "art", with little knowledge base that all professionals could turn to.
- Goals were perceived as vague.
- Control norms were seen as necessary by administrators.
- There was a lack of professional support.

We now know that successful schools must turn these norms and beliefs around. Little's research of teachers' workplace conditions in successful schools revealed two prevailing norms: a "norm of collegiality" and a "norm of continuous improvement." These norms provide the foundation for the school and district culture in successful schools.

The norm of collegiality is well supported by research. Johnson & Johnson's analysis (1987) of 133 research studies on the comparative effects of cooperation, competition, and individualistic work styles among adults found the following:

- Cooperative modes influenced higher achievement than did the competitive or individualistic learning modes.
- Cooperation promoted more positive interpersonal relationships and social support.
- Cooperation promoted higher self esteem than competition.

Standards for the kind of collegiality that results in improvement are suggested by Little (1982, 1989):

- There must be clarity of expectations of the level of effort and time commitment that will be required.
- There must be active collective involvement of principal, teachers, and district-level support staff.

- The necessary time for shared work must be made available and for peer "coaching" in the change process.
- The implementation of any significant change should be gradual over an extended period of time, allowing development of a "shared language" about the change.
- There must be a sharp focus on curriculum and instruction problems as the driving force and reason for the change.
- Generally, a level of commitment of about 75 percent of the school faculty is necessary to sustain the change.

The norm of continuous improvement refers to the belief system in which teachers view their professional involvement as a process of lifelong learning and growth. This clearly takes us beyond what has typically been thought of as "staff development." Professional growth and development becomes an integral part of the total milieu of teaching, thus encompassing workplace conditions (Mahaffy, 1990).

In order to foster this vision, Little's research (1982, 1989) suggests that there must be group, rather than individualistic, involvement in development and implementation of new practices. Such collective involvement has the benefits of clarifying the concept and understanding of the desired change, preventing "avoidance" behaviors, lowering the perceived risk, and creating a "critical mass" of professionals necessary to make the change schoolwide.

While supporting the value of collegiality, Little (1989) warns against its use as a mandated approach in a situation where there are no other organizational structures to support it. This "induced collaboration" carries high costs in time spent on adjusting to working together and in risk of being exposed to new kinds of criticism and conflict in small groups. Forced collegiality doesn't work: "At issue here is the congruence or fit between naturally occurring relations among teachers and those collaborations that emerge in the course of institutionally sponsored initiatives" (p. 29).

Continuing her examination, she finds that collegiality alone is not the answer to school improvement or effective professional development programs:

> Patterns of interaction that support mutual assistance or routine sharing may count well for maintaining a certain level of workforce stability, teacher satisfaction and a performance "floor"; they seem less likely, however, to account for high rates of innovation or for high levels of collective commitment to specific curricular or instructional policies.

Hargreaves and Dawe (1989) discuss the concept of a collaborative culture that must be facilitated and supported by leadership so that informal collegiality supports the formal collaborations required in professional development programs. They also warn against "contrived collegiality" which can undermine the development of this collegial culture.

Mahaffy (1990) suggests a series of conditions that should be in place prior to the introduction of collaborative processes in an organization, and these, too, relate to professional development efforts:

- Some predisposition among faculty for improvement.
- The building principal understands and supports the concepts of collaboration and norms of collegiality.
- The school is the unit for change.
- Teachers and administrators are seen as an important resource and an effort is made to support and take advantage of this.
- Support for enhancing teacher effectiveness is based on knowledge of what teachers do (p. 29).

Significant role and relationship changes that must occur to foster school improvement have been noted by both Rosenholtz (1989) and Little (1982, 1989):

- Teachers and administrators work together rather than separately to set goals and priorities for students.
- Teacher evaluation is collaborative between teachers and administrators.
- Parent participation is planned cooperatively between teachers and administrators.
- Teachers work collaboratively with each other to solve school-wide problems and design curriculum.
- Teachers observe and critique each other's work.
- Teachers see it as their responsibility to help each other learn and to increase opportunities for exchange of information about teaching.

Unfortunately, the context for making these significant changes in roles and relationships has some major barriers. Rosenholtz (1989) cites a "twenty-year decline in teachers' job commitment which has paralleled increasing bureaucratic rather than professional control in schools...hierarchical control and professionalism, like sibling rivals, do not get along well with each other." The leadership challenge is to see the inherent relationship which exists between teachers' job commitment and the nature of the organizations in which they work. Rosenholtz's research suggests that school success is inextricably tied to teachers' commitment, effort, and involvement. In order to accomplish this, organizational rules must be established to foster the following aspects of the work life of teachers:

- **Psychic Rewards**--knowledge of the success of their efforts, positive and academically successful relations with individual students, and external recognitions from parents, colleagues, and principals.

- **Increased Task Autonomy and Discretion**--personal responsibility for the outcomes of work, believing that their performance is attributable directly to their own efforts.

- **Meaningful Work**--work that is important to teacher's personal values and beliefs, including opportunities for professional growth, teacher "efficacy," and a belief that they are having positive influences on students.

How, then, should the workplace be structured to contribute to these critical elements of the teacher's (and administrator's) work life? Rosenholtz identifies four critical requirements: (1) **time** for teachers to assist, watch, and plan instructional strategies; time to take part in task-related interactions with colleagues during the workday; and extended time to learn and master new skills and implement them in the classroom; (2) collective **involvement** in decision making; (3) a **belief** that it is necessary and legitimate to ask for and to give help in order to improve instructional practices; and (4) teacher and principal **collaboration** on the clarification of goals, process, and outcomes of teacher evaluation.

The major mechanism which is being used to attempt to implement these requirements has been termed "site-based management" (or sometimes "school-based management"). The interest in this process is not new. Indeed, it was popular throughout the 1960s and 1970s as a method to either increase political power of local communities, increase administrative efficiency, or counter state authority (David 1989). The renewed interest during the current "restructuring" movement has different purposes. First, there is growing evidence of the negative effects of strong central control on teacher morale and level of effort. That evidence is now generally accepted, creating general discomfort with a "command and control" structure. Second, the purpose now seems to be to "empower" schools to make more dramatic improvement in educational practice and, ultimately, in student outcomes, shifting from a "target" to a "center" of improvement and inquiry. Purposes in the 1960s and 1970s tended to be more politically motivated through transferring power to local sites. At the core of the current experimentation is the move to increase school decision making vis-a-vis the central office of the district, and, within the school then, to create a decision-making process that shares authority among principals, teachers and, in some cases, parents.

The following points are made related to research on school-based management (David, 1989):

- Teachers report increased job satisfaction and feelings of professionalism when real authority is given, even though such authority requires extra time and energy.

- Granting only "marginal" authority with many rules for how the system must operate creates frustration.

- Extra time and new and varied opportunities need to be provided to both school-site teachers and administrators, as well as central office personnel, to make significant changes in their roles.

- Operational details of how the site-based management system must operate are secondary to the "leadership, culture, and support of the district."

- The period for full implementation of site-based management will require from 5-10 years.

- Districts with successful implementation are characterized by strongly supportive superintendents who develop principals' skills and who reward principals who involve teachers in decision making.

Finally, and most important, the extent to which the school site has a direct focus on improvement in student outcomes will be critical to the school's ability to be a high performer (Blum and Cotton, 1990; Levine and Lezotte, 1990). The rush to implement restructuring seems to be obscuring this maxim. Analysis of descriptions of a wide range of experiments in site-based management would suggest that few efforts are drawing such a direct linkage among new forms of decision-making rules, changing roles and responsibilities, and improvement in student outcomes (David, Purkey & White, 1989; Lewis, 1989). Based on this analysis, NWREL's School Improvement Program has constructed the following useful graphic display of the different focal points of site-based "improvement" vis-a-vis site-based "management." A cursory review of this chart would indicate that focusing on the issues at the top of the chart has the greatest potential for moving from a "command" to a "results" orientation. Yet a recent analysis of over 30 districts experimenting with some form of site-based management revealed that budget decisions tended to be decentralized first, and only later, if at all, were key instruction and curriculum decisions decentralized (Clune and White 1988).

# Shared Decision Making

**School Improvement**

**Instructional**
- School Improvement: Goals, Standards, Targets
- Curriculum: Content, Materials, Sequence
- Assessment: Indicators, Measures, Data
- Teaching: Approaches, Strategies, Practices
- Schoolwide: Culture, Climate, Practices
- Staff Development: Content, Approaches, Logistics

**Personnel**
- Staffing: Selection, Hiring, Utilization
- Staff Development: Induction, Inservice

**Budget**
- Staff
- Discretionary
- Staff Development

**Site Based Management**

**Administrative**
- Transportation
- Food Service

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 275-9500

**Self Analysis Form*: Examining Our Organizational Support for Professional Development**

After reading the above section on organizational characteristics, please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the statements below. (Circle the appropriate number for the scale on each item.

*1 = Strongly Disagree* *2 = Agree* *3 = Unsure*
*4 = Agree* *5 = Strongly Agree*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | When teachers get together, they usually talk about teaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. | Professional development focuses on teaching practices, not on teachers as individuals. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. | Hearing teachers discuss instructional concerns is nearly an everyday occurrence. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. | Equity of responsibility and effort is usually present among staff planning together. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. | Teachers depend on interaction with colleagues to help them teach most effectively. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. | Better teaching occurs, in part, because teachers interact with and rely on colleagues. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. | Experimentation is encouraged, supported, and results shared with colleagues. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. | There are numerous situations in which teachers need to talk and interact. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. | Teachers are able to find time for professional discussion and interaction. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. | Teachers depend on each other as sources and "sounding boards" for new ideas. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

* Adapted from Mahaffy, J.E. Evaluation of Support System Model. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, September 1990.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11. | Most meetings or projects are designed such that teachers are interactively involved. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. | The administration stresses the use of an agreed-upon language to discuss instruction. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. | Joint development of curriculum and instructional materials is a common practice. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. | The majority of teachers engage in discussions about teaching and learning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. | Jointly designing lesson plans or instructional units is not uncommon. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. | Teachers are able to find time needed to conduct observations and related discussions. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17. | Shared planning readily occurs outside formal structures, such as committees. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 18. | Teachers' opinions and recommendations are valued by the administration. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 19. | Teachers believe that joint work usually produces the best planning and materials. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 20. | The administration often structures tasks requiring joint planning by teachers. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 21. | Observation of each others' teaching is an important part of professional development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 22. | The administration encourages joint planning by providing time and resources. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 23. | Most teachers share a common "language" to describe teaching and learning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 24. | Teachers are willing to take the time and effort needed for joint planning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 25. | Teachers observing each others' teaching is an accepted practice. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 26. | Some important results could not be realized without joint planning and development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27. | Teachers observing in each others' classrooms is the norm, not the exception. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28. | The work staff committees and similar groups is seen as productive and important. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29. | When observing a colleagues' teaching, the practice, not the person, is the focus. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30. | Faculty meetings are largely spent discussing instructional concerns. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 31. | When colleagues provide feedback from an observation, it is clear, focused, and precise. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 32. | Teachers work together collaboratively, rather than competitively. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 33. | Teachers often talk about teaching outside formal committee or faculty meetings. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 34. | Teachers see observation and feedback as a positive way to improve their teaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 35. | The administration expects much joint planning and development to regularly occur. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 36. | The administration endeavors to provide needed professional development resources. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 37. | Effort and concern help make principal's observations beneficial to teachers. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 38. | Teachers rely on each other to help them test and implement new practices. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 39. | Teachers depend on each others' classroom observations to improve their teaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 40. | The administration provides forums for teacher discussion and interaction. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 41. | Obstacles to classroom observations can usually be overcome. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 42. | The practice of teaching is open to continuous scrutiny as a means for improvement. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 43. | The administration expects colleagues to observe and discuss each others' teaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 44. | Whether group inservice or one-to-one coaching, colleagues teach and learn from each other. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 45. | The administration values observation and helps provide time and resources to facilitate it. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 46. | The administration reinforces the accomplishments resulting from joint planning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 47. | The administration supports teacher training in classroom observation and feedback. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 48. | Effective teaching is viewed as practices to be mastered, not a matter of style or charisma. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 49. | Teachers are able to find needed time for joint planning and development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 50. | Teachers are able to find time needed to conduct observations and related discussions. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 51. | Colleagues work through ongoing collaboration to improve the practice of teaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 52. | Teachers depend on colleagues' participation in joint planning and development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 53. | The administration views observation as an important means of improving teaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 54. | Teachers help determine the content and format of their own professional development. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 55. | Together, teachers continuously try new ideas in the search for better teaching practices. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 56. | Teachers find time to work on instructional improvement efforts important to them. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 57. | Teachers have good access to desired professional development activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 58. | Teachers are expected to strive for continuous professional improvement. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 59. | Teachers discuss instructional matters in specific, detailed, and concrete terms. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 60. | Teachers are expected to maintain high standards of professional competence. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Au, K. and Jordan, C. "Teaching Reading to Hawaiian Children: Finding a Culturally Appropriate Solution," in Trueba, H., Guthrie, G. P. and Au, K. (eds.), Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1981.

Berliner, D. C. "A Status Report on the Study of Teacher Effectiveness." Journal of Research in Science Teaching (1986): 369-382.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review, prepared for the U.S. Office of Education Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, April 1975.

Bloom, B. "The 2 Sigma Problem: the Search for Methods of Group Instruction As Effective as One-to-One Tutoring." Educational Researcher (June/July 1984): 4-16.

Brookfield, S. D. Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1986.

Brundage, D. H. and Mackeracher, D. Adult Learning Principles and Their Application to Program Planning. Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1980.

Butler, J. "A Review of Adult Learning Theory and Staff Development Research." In School Leader Development for School Improvement, International School Improvement Project Technical Report #8, R. E. Blum and J. A. Butler (Eds.). Leuven, Belgium: ACCO, 1989.

Butterfield, R. A. Effective Practices in Indian Education: Curriculum Monograph. Portland, OR: Research and Development Program on Indian Education, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1985.

Carnegie Task Force On Teaching As A Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. NY: Carnegie Corporation, 1986.

Clune, W. & White, P. School Based Management: Institutional Variation Implementation, & Issues for Further Research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University, 1988.

Conklin, N. F. and Olson, T. A. Toward More Effective Education for Poor, Minority Students in Rural Areas: What the Research Suggests. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, November 1988.

Cook, W.J., Jr. Bill Cook's Strategic Planning for America's Schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1988.

Corbett, H. D. On the Meaning of Restructuring. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1990.

Corrigan, D.; Haberman, M.; and Howey, K. Adult Learning and Development; Implications for In-Service Teacher Education--An American Point of View. Paris, France: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1979.

Cotton, K. Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis 1990 Update. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1990.

Cotton, K. Expectations and Student Outcomes. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1989.

Cotton, K. Topical Synthesis #4-Educating Urban Minority Youth: Research on Effective Practices. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, November 1990.

Cross, K. P. Adults as Learners: Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.

Cuban, L. "The At Risk Label and the Problem of Urban School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan (June 1989): 780-801.

Cummins, J. "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention." Harvard Educational Review 56/1 (February 1986): 18-36.

Darkenwald, G. G. and Merriam, S. B. Adult Education: Foundations of Practice. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

David, J. L. "Synthesis of Research on School Based Management," Educational Leadership. (May 1989): 45-53.

David, J.L., Purkey, S. & White, P. Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts. Washington, D.C.: National Governors Association, 1989.

Dillon-Peterson, B. (Ed.) Staff Development/Organization Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Drurian, G., and Butler, J. A. Effective Schooling Practices and At-Risk Youth: What the Research Shows. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1987.

Duke, D. L. and Corno, L. "Evaluating Staff Development." In Staff Development/Organization Development, Dillon-Peterson, B. (Ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Edmonds, R. R. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor. "Educational Leadership 37 (1979): 15-27.

Evered, R. D. and Selman, J. C. "Coaching & the Art of Management," Organizational Dynamics (Autumn 1989): 16-32.

Finn, C. E., Jr. "The Biggest Reform of All," Phi Delta Kappan. 71/8 (April 1990): 584-592

Frymier, J. A Study of Students at Risk: Collaborating to Do Research. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1989.

Fullan, M. G. The Meaning of Educational Change. Ontario: OISE Press/The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1982.

Fullan, M. G. "Staff Development, Innovation, and Institutional Development." In Changing School Culture Through Staff Development, Bruce Joyce (Ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 3-25, 1990.

Fullan, M. G.; Bennett, B.; and Rolheiser-Bennett, C."Linking Classroom and School Improvement." Educational Leadership, (1990): 47:8, 13-19.

Gage, N. "What Do We Know About Teaching Effectiveness?" Phi Delta Kappan (1984): 66:2, 87-93.

Gall, M. D. and Renchler, R. S. Effective Development for Teachers: A Research-Based Model. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1985.

Garcia, E. E. "Attributes of Effective Schools for Language Minority Students." Education and Urban Society (1988): 387-398.

Garcia, H. and Noble, M. "Equity, Equality, Excellence, and Empowerment: Their Significance for Language Minority Students." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (April 1988).

Griffin, G. A. "Staff Development." Paper prepared for the NIE Teaching Synthesis Conference, Airlie House, Virginia, 1982.

Griswold, P. A.; Cotton, K. J.; and Hansen, J. B. Effective Compensatory Education Sourcebook. Volume I: A Review of Effective Educational Practices. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1986.

Guskey, T. R. "Staff Development and Teacher Change." Educational Leadership. (April 1985): 57-60.

Hall, G. E. and Hord, S. M. Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process. Ithaca, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Hall, G. E. and Loucks, S. F. Program Definition and Adaptation: Implications for Inservice. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1980.

Hargreaves, A. and Dawe, R. "Coaching as Unreflective Practice: Contrived Collegiality or Collaborative Culture?" Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 1989.

Hathaway, W. E., and Kushman, J. W. Rising to the Challenge of Differential School Performance Among Student Ethnic Groups. Portland, OR: Center for Urban Research in Education, Portland State University, Portland Public Schools and Center for Great City Schools, May 1988.

Hodgkinson, H. L. All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten through Graduate School. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc., 1985.

Hodgkinson, H. L., The Same Client: The Demographics of Education and Service Delivery Systems. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc./Center for Demographic Policy, 1989.

Howey, K. "Inservice Research - Six Functions of Staff Development: A Selective Review of the Literature." R&DCTE Review: The Newsletter of the Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, (1985): 3:1-2, 9-10.

Howey, K. R.; Matthes, W. A.; and Zimpher, N. L. Issues and Problems in Professional Development. Oak Brook IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1985.

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, 1990.

Johnson, David W. & Johnson, Roger T., "Research Shows the Benefits of Adult Cooperation," Educational Leadership (November 1987): 27-30.

Jones, B.F. and Fennimore, T.F., "Video Conference 1: The New Definition of Learning: The First Step to School Reform." Restructuring to Promote Learning in America's Schools: Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1990.

Joyce, B. (Ed.). Changing School Culture Through Staff Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ("Part IV, Opportunities to Learn: District Initiatives"), 1990.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. "The Coaching of Teaching." Educational Leadership, (October 1982): 4-10.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. Student Achievement Through Staff Development. New York: Longman. 1988.

Keller, J. M. "Strategies for Stimulating the Motivation to Learn." Performance and Instruction, (1987a) 26:9, 1-7.

Keller, J. M. "The Systematic Process of Motivational Design." Performance and Instruction, (1987b) 26:9, 1-8.

Keller, J. M. and Kopp, T. W. "Application of the ARCS Model of Motivational Design." In Instructional Theories in Action: Lessons Illustrating Selected Theories and Models, C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1987.

Kidd, J. R. How Adults Learn. New York: Association Press, 1975.

Kleinfeld, J. S. Effective Teachers of Indian and Eskimo High School Students. Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska, 1972.

Korinek, L.; Schmid, R.; and McAdams, M. "Inservice Types and Best Practices." Journal of Research and Development in Education, (1985): 18:2, 33-38.

Knowles, M. The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy. Chicago, IL: Folklett Publishing Co., 1970.

Knowles, M. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company, 1978.

Knox, A. B. (1977) Adult Learning and Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kolb, D. A. Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984.

Lanier, J. E. and Little, J. W."Research on Teacher Education." In Handbook of Research on Teaching/Third Edition, Merlin C. Wittrock (Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986: 527-569.

Krupp, J. A. "Using the Power of the Principalship to Motivate Experienced Teachers." The Journal of Staff Development, (1986) 7:2, 100-110.

Levin, H. M. Educational Reform for Disadvantaged Students: An Emerging Crisis. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1986.

Levin, H. M. "New Schools for the Disadvantaged." Denver, CO: MidContinent Regional Educational Laboratory, June 1987.

Levine, D. U. and Lezotte, L. Unusually Effective Schools: A Review and Analysis of Research & Practice. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools, 1990.

Lewis, Anne. Restructuring America's Schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1989.

Lieberman, Ann (ed.) Rethinking School Improvement. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. "Restructuring Schools: What Matters and What Works." Phi Delta Kappan (June 1990): 759-764.

Little, J. W. "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success." American Educational Research Journal (Fall 1982): 325-340.

Little, J.W. "The Persistence of Privacy: Autonomy & Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Symposium of Teachers' Work & Teacher Culture, March 1989.

Little, J. W. (1986) "Seductive Images and Organizational Realities in Professional Development." In Rethinking School Improvement/ Research, Craft, and Concept, Ann Lieberman (Ed.) New York: Teachers College Press, 26-44.

Loucks, S. F. and Zigarmi, P. "Effective STaff Development". Educational Considerations, (1981): 8:2, 4-8.

Loucks-Horsley, S., et al. Continuing to Learn/ A Guidebook for Teacher Development. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands and The National Staff Development Council, 1987.

Mahaffy, J. E. Building the Collaborative School: A New Set of Norms. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1990.

Mahaffy, J.E. Evaluation of Support System Model. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, September 1990.

McCune, S. Tools for Restructuring School. Transparencies from presentation at the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Spring Leadership Symposium, April 1989.

McLune, S.D. Guide to Strategic Planning for Educators. Alexandria, VA: American Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.

McWilliams, E. S., ed. Resegregation of Public Schools: The Third Generation. Washington, D. C.: Network of Regional Desegregation Assistance Centers, June 1989.

Miles, M. B. "Unraveling the Mystery of Institutionalization. "Educational Leadership, (November 1983): 14-19.

Natriello, G.; McDill, E. L.; and Pallas, A. M. Schooling Disadvantaged Children: Racing Against Catastrophe. NY: Teachers College Press, 1990.

Newman, F.M. "Linking Restructuring to Authentic Student Achievement," Phi Delta Kappan (February 1991): 458-463.

Oakes, J. Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1985.

O'Connell, C. Review of Research on Conducting Workshops. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1985.

Odiorne, G. S. Strategic Management of Human Resources. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Oja, S. N. "Adult Development is Implicit in Staff Development." Journal of Staff Development, (1980) 1:2, 7-56.

Olson, T.A. "Grouping Students for Instruction: Selection or Acceleration?" Bridge (Journal of the Oregon Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development) (1990) 2/3 4-10.

Orlich, D. C. A Handbook for Staff Development. Federal Way, WA: The State Staff Development Council, 1984.

Pallas, A.; Natriello, G.; and McDill, E. L. Who Falls Behind: Defining the 'At Risk' Population--Current Dimensions and Future Trends. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (April 1988).

Pepper, F. C. Effective Practices in Indian Education: A Teacher's Monograph. Portland, OR: Research and Development Program for Indian Education, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1985.

Philips, S. U. The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. New York: Longman, 1983.

Pink, W. T. "Staff Development for Urban School Improvement: Lessons Learned from Two Case Studies." School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice, (January 1990): 1:1, 41-60.

Presseissen, B. Z. Teaching Thinking and At-Risk Students: Understanding the Problems. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1987.

Purkey, S. C. and Marshall S. S. "Effective Schools: A Review." The Elementary School Journal, (1983): 83:4, 427-453.

Reed, S. and Sautter, R. C. "Children in Poverty: The Status of 12 Million Young Americans." Phi Delta Kappan (1990): 71/10 1-12.

Rosenholtz, S. J. Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc., 1989.

Rosenholtz, S. J. "Workplace Conditions That Affect Teacher Quality and Commitment: Implications for Teacher Induction Programs." The Elementary School Journal (March 1989): 422-439.

Rowan, B. and Guthrie, L. The Quality of Chapter One Instruction: Results from a Study of 24 Schools. San Francisco, CA: Far West Regional Educational Laboratory, 1988.

Ryan, T. F. and Crowell, R. A. "Evaluation for Non-Evaluators: Assessing Staff Development Outcomes." The Journal of Staff Development, (1982): 3:1, 156-169.

Schmuck, R. A. and Runkel, P. J. The Handbook of Organizational Development in Schools. Prospect Heights, IL; Waveland Press, 1985.

Schneider, J. M. "Tracking: A National Perspective." Equity and Choice (1989): 6/1 11-17.

Showers, B. Transfer of Training: The Contribution of Coaching. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1983.

Showers, B.; Joyce, B.; and Bennett, B. "Synthesis of Research on Staff Development: A Framework for Future Study and a State-of-the-Art Analysis." Educational Leadership, (February 1987): 45:3, 77-87.

Shuell, T. J. "Phases of Meaningful Learning." Review of Educational Research (1990): 60:4, 531-547.

Simmons, J. M. and Schuette, M. K. "Strengthening Teachers' Reflective Decision Making." Journal of Staff Development, (1988): 9:3, 18-27.

Sinclair, R. and Ghory, W. Reaching Marginal Students. New York: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1987.

Sirotnik, K.A. & Clark, R. W. "School-Centered Decision Making & Renewal," Phi Delta Kappan (May 1988): 660-664.

Slavin, R. E. "Cooperative Learning." Review of Educational Research 50/2 (Summer 1980): 315-342

Slavin, R. E. Grouping for Instruction: Equity and Effectiveness. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Elementary and Secondary Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 1987.

Smith, R. M. Learning How to Learn: Applied Theory for Adults. Chicago, IL: Follett Publishing Company, 1982.

Slavin, R. E.; Karweit, N. L.; and Madden, N. A. Effective Programs for Students at Risk. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1989.

Sparks, D. and Loucks-Horsley, S. "Five Models of Staff Development for Teachers." Journal of Staff Development, (1989): 10:4, 40-57.

Sparks, D. and Loucks-Horsley, S. "Models of Staff Development." Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, Houston, W.R. (Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990: 234-250.

Sparks, G. M. "Synthesis of Research on Staff Development for Effective Teaching." Educational Leadership, (November 1983): 65-72.

Stockard, J. and Mayberry, M. The Relationships Between School Environments and Student Achievement: A Review of the Literature. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, March 1988.

Timar, T. "The Politics of School Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan (December 1989): 265-275.

Tracy, S. J. "Linking Teacher Growth and Student Growth." The Clearing House, (1990): 64, 80-82.

United Way. What Lies Ahead: Countdown to the 21st Century. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America Strategic Institute, 1989.

Verduin, J.; Miller, H.; and Greer, C. Adults Teaching Adults: Principles and Strategies. Austin, TX: Learning Concepts (1977).

Wade, R. K. "What Makes a Difference in Inservice Teacher Education? A Meta-Analysis of Research." Educational Leadership, (December 1984): 42, 48-54.

Ward, B. "Close Up #2: Instructional Grouping in the Classroom." School Improvement Research Series. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1987.

Waterman, R. H., Jr., The Renewal Factor: How the Best Get & Keep the Competitive Edge. NY: Bantam Books, 1987.

Whitaker, K. A. and Moses, M. C. "Teacher Empowerment: A Key to Restructuring." The Clearing House (November/December 1990): 127-130.

Willis, H. D. Students at Risk: A Review of Conditions, Circumstances, Indicators and Educational Implications. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1986.

Witkin, H. A. Cognitive Styles in Personal and Cultural Adaptation. Hartford, CT: Clark University Press, 1978.

Wlodkowski, R. Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn: A Guide to Improving Instruction and Increasing Learner Achievement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. (1985)

Wood, F. H.; McQuairrie, F. O., Jr.; and Thompson, S. R. "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs." In Staff Development/Organization Development, Dillon-Peterson, B. (Ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Wood, F. H.; Thompson, S. R.; and Russell, F. "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs. "In Staff Development/Organizational Development, Betty Dillon-Peterson (Ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Zemke, R. and Zemke, S. "30 Things We Know For Sure About Adult Learning." Training, (June 1981): 45-52.